

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I think we can go on with the Revenue Board Bill now.

MYSORE BOARD OF REVENUE BILL, 1954

Motion to consider (contd.)

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Mr. Speaker, provision is made in this Bill about the revision of the order passed by the Revenue Board. But I find there is nothing about the revision of the orders passed by the Minister.

Sri P. R. RAMAIIYA (Basavangudi).—Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear what the Hon'ble Member is speaking.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—Mr. Speaker, in this Revenue Board Bill luckily some provision is made for the review of the orders passed by the Board. But the Hon'ble Minister during the previous session promised that amendment will also be made to review the orders passed by the Revenue Minister. I want to know whether it has not been so passed? He knows that according to the decision of our own High Court there is no provision in the Revenue Act to review the order passed by the Minister or the Deputy Commissioner or the Sub-Division Officer. So it is high time, that the Minister will give attention towards that. And the second thing that I want to bring to the notice is, in this Bill so many persons have to be appointed as the members of the Board. I was not here when the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition was speaking. It is better that a District Judge and a non-official who can be appointed as a High Court Judge, be appointed instead of having the Revenue Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and the Local Self-Government Commissioner. Because, I learn they will be having a lot of work. I do not know whether they will find time to sit in the court and hear the appeals; it will be very difficult for them. I learn also Sir, those officers have expressed their views that it is not possible for them to sit as regular judges.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—They are in full agreement with the provisions of this Bill.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—So, it is better that only two members should constitute the Board rather than having all these persons. Then only some full justice will be given to the clients. Otherwise, it will be impossible for them to go to the Court. Supposing the cases are posted twice in a week or twice in a month or once in a fortnight, it will be very difficult for them to attend the court. It is better that this court should be held just like regular courts from 2 P.M. to 5 P.M. or from 11 A.M. to 2 P.M. and the appeals are disposed of as expeditiously as possible. No doubt, according to the Revenue Minister, he has disposed of all the appeals. It is very necessary that only two members should constitute the Board instead of having a large number of persons. And provision is made for a member of the Board to grant stay and to pass some interim orders on the interim applications. That is a very good provision. Supposing the application is put up before the Board, it will be very difficult for the parties to get a stay order or any interim order passed. So, I think the provision made in this Bill for a judge to sit regularly and to pass orders on this interim application is quite laudable. With these few words, Sir, I wholeheartedly approve this, Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Can I take it that there is nobody to speak?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Is it not possible to provide for appeal or review to the High Court from the decisions of the Board? As a matter of abundant precaution, is it not possible, in certain cases at least, to provide for revision, if not appeal to the High Court—in certain matters where question of law is involved such as succession and other things? A very important question can come up, a very important question involving law may have to be decided. For example, there is the question of succession to the place of Patel or Shanbhogue and many hereditary rights are involved. So in all such cases, instead of making it final, why not we make a provision that where a question

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

of law is involved or where important matters are concerned, the matter may be taken up in appeal to the High Court? It will be a healthy move.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—As regards the points raised by my friend, Sri Imam, there is an amendment to the Clause providing for the appointment of members of the Board. Personally, I have no objection to make it obligatory on the part of the Government to appoint a District Judge or a person qualified to be a Judge of the High Court. We will consider this matter when the amendment is taken up.

As regards the point that provision should be made for an appeal to the High Court, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to article 226 of the constitution, which gives adequate relief to the party and the High Court under article 227 has got powers of superintendence over all the tribunals including this. Therefore, there is no need for providing an appeal to the High Court because a District Judge will be there and in certain cases, if the party is affected, he can take advantage of article 226. These are matters which involve questions of administrative as well as judicial aspects. I do not think there is need for providing for appeals to the High Court.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—I am seeking a clarification from the Hon'ble Minister. The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has made out a point that as the work of this Board which is going to be constituted as a result of this legislation is going to be such as to involve highly judicial matters, matters concerning the status and the rights of parties, particularly under the Village Offices Act, it should not be that the first appellate body or the first original body as the case may be should be almost the deciding body on a matter of that kind. That raises a question of principle also where justiceable matters or such matters as affect the personal rights of individuals are concerned, there should always be a provision for a first appeal.

The Hon'ble Minister for Revenue seems to assure himself that article 226 of the Constitution meets the contingency in view, but I am afraid my reading of article 226—possibly I may be wrong lends itself to a different interpretation altogether. Article 226 will apply where a certain body which otherwise is competent to handle a matter, has not done so, or, in other words, where there is an excess of jurisdiction or the use of a jurisdiction which does not vest in a particular body, it has nevertheless been exercised by that body, article 226 can be invoked and the High Court can say either by the *quo warranto* or other appropriate writs under article 226: 'This body which did not have this jurisdiction has nevertheless exercised it. To that extent the proceedings are *ab initio* void.' What the Leader of Opposition has in view is a straightaway appeal on merits. Suppose it is found that a particular decision is not correct. Then in such a case, article 226 will not be of avail. Therefore, the request to the Hon'ble Minister, if I have understood the mind of the Leader of Opposition aright, is, provide for a first appeal against a decision of the Board, irrespective of the competence or otherwise of the invocation of the High Court's jurisdiction and powers under article 226 read along with article 227. I personally see there is absolutely no reason why this has not been done. In fact, if I may say so, without meaning any disrespect to the Minister, there is this tendency of taking away rights which ordinarily are those of the law courts. Why do you want quasi-judicial bodies to encroach upon the powers which are legitimately and really of the courts? Therefore, considering both these aspects, I appeal to the Minister through you to provide for this appeal which will give satisfaction to the client and what is more, the very framework of legislation when it is looked at even on a theoretical basis, will give satisfaction to a person to say: 'Here is a first appeal to the highest judicial body. Can there be a higher seat of justice than the High

Court? There is an appeal to the highest judicial body.' It gives entire satisfaction and I personally feel there should be no reason why Government should hesitate and not accept a suggestion of this kind which is very welcome and very wholesome as coming particularly from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I think he said if law is involved, an appeal to the High Court may be provided for, not on merits.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Appeal means merits also.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I want to amplify it a little further. Not only provide for a contingency of going to the High Court in cases where there is an error of law, but even ordinarily provide a first appeal to the highest court. That will give satisfaction to the party. Here is a quasi-judicial body engaged in decision and there is also the correcting or the appellate body like the High Court perfecting it altogether. It will give satisfaction to the clientele and it will be to the credit of this Government to make a provision of this kind. All things considered, I feel this suggestion as made out by the Leader of Opposition will commend itself to the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA (Arkalgud).—I want to know whether such a change has been made in any other State.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I am afraid my friend from Arkalgud should understand the position. If you are thinking of the analogy of a legislation of this kind from Madras, the matters are entirely different. Fortunately—and in fact I may congratulate this Government—this legislation goes much beyond the scope of similar set up both in Bombay and in Madras. If you take such a big step, why do you fall short of not completing it?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City—South).—If we have to accept what Sri Pattabhiraman just now submitted, then in that case, in the Bill provision is made for revision to Government. In any case, if we have

to give an appellate jurisdiction to the High Court, the question of revisional power to Government has to be given up. I think during the last discussion when it came up for consideration, the opinion of the members was that Government should have some hand in matters that come up before the Board of Revenue. It is with that object in view I hope that the Members of the Joint Select Committee, who kept that point in view, did not think of including the High Court for the appellate jurisdiction and I would like to know from the Minister whether I am correct in what I have said regarding the opinion that many of the members wanted that Government should not give up their entire hold in revenue matters that come up before the Board of Revenue. I feel they should have powers of revision. I think I myself spoke on this Bill at the time when it came up for consideration and I said that Government should have power of Revision. Perhaps my friend Sri K. Pattabhiraman himself was also a member of the Joint Select Committee. (*Sri K. Pattabhiraman.*—No). The members of the Joint Select Committee kept that in view and that is why jurisdiction of the High Court has not been invoked. I personally feel that Government should consider whether they should not leave this appellate power to the High Court because the High Court is the highest judiciary in Mysore State. It is better that just to infuse greater confidence in the public that an appeal . . . (*Interruption*). My friend Sri K. Puttaswamy wants to put certain things in my mouth, which I did not say. I never meant that the people have no confidence in the Government, but greater confidence will be placed by people if a matter like this, which is purely justiceable and juridical in nature, is left to the High Court and it is for the Government to say whether it is proper or not.

***Sri K. PUTTASWAMY** (Srirangapatna).—I rise to oppose the suggestion made of giving revisional powers to the High Court. The argument that is just now advanced goes to show that the Hon'ble Members who made this suggestion doubt the

* Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.)

integrity of the Government. (Sri B. Narayanaswamy.—*I never said that.*) or are not prepared to place so much of confidence in the Government and they would like to place confidence in the judiciary. The matters that come under the purview of the Revenue Board are such as where the Government has more intimate knowledge than the High Court, and, even the Revenue Board as sought to be constituted would be having one of the persons who would be competent to be appointed as a District Judge or a District Judge himself and the other members are persons who would have gone through the various stages, who have had a lot of experience in the various departments and as such there is absolutely no reason to doubt that they would go wrong and even if they go wrong in any matter, the Government can set it right by exercising its revisional powers in certain cases, and there is absolutely no force in the argument advanced by the Hon'ble Member who pleaded that revisional powers should be vested in the High Court and not in the Government. Therefore, I feel that the present proposal may be accepted as recommended by the Select Committee.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—On a previous occasion I had the privilege of answering the point now raised. Under the Constitution, the functions of the Judiciary, the Executive and the Legislature have been definitely defined. The Legislature has got certain defined functions. So also the Executive and so also the Judiciary. The Executive power of the State is vested in the Governor or the Rajpramukh to be exercised through his officers and through the Ministers. The Legislature ought to be supreme in its own domain; the Judiciary should also be supreme in its own domain and the Executive should be supreme in its own domain. The powers that will be exercised by the Board are powers vested in Government. The Government is delegating these powers to the Board. Therefore, it is not necessary for the Judiciary to interfere in the day

to day executive functions of the Government.

4 P.M.

If this analogy can be extended further, it is quite possible to argue that instead of the Deputy Commissioner and the Amildar there must be appointed a Judicial Officer to exercise the functions of the Executive Officers and to interpret the enactment and rules. Therefore, I must bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Members that nowhere in India, if I remember and if my knowledge is correct, an appeal has been provided to the High Court against the decisions of the Board. This is the first time we establish a Board in Mysore. Let us study the working of the Board. If the Hon'ble Members afterwards feel that there should be an appeal to the High Court in certain cases, we can consider. Now, I think, as rightly observed by my friend Sri K. Puttaswamy, there is no need for providing an appeal to the High Court.

Sri R. Anantaraman suggested that the Government should have powers to review their own orders. Under the scheme of the Bill, the decisions of the Board are final and no appeal lies against the decisions of the Board. In certain cases, revision lies to Government. It is not proper to review the orders passed by Government on a revision petition. Further, it is not the intention of the Government to review their own orders, when there is already review power vested in the Board.

Sir, last time I was asked to file a financial memorandum. As the Bill was originally drafted, there was no provision for appointing a District Judge and there was no extra financial liability. The Select Committee has amended the Bill to provide for the appointment of a District Judge which involves some additional expenditure. Therefore, I file the financial memorandum. I will just read out.—

“Financial Memorandum to the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1955.

The cost for establishing the Board of Revenue will be as follows :—

	<i>Average cost per month</i>
	Rs.
One District Judge ...	1,000
One Secretary ...	400
One Head Clerk ...	150
Two Bench Clerks ...	250
Four Steno-typists ...	560
One Record-Keeper ...	110
One Process Writer ...	65
Two Appeal clerks ...	220
One Copyists Examiner ...	110
Two Copyists ...	130
Two Attenders ...	55
Two Daffedars ...	50
Five Peons ...	100
Recurring contingencies ...	100
Total ...	3,300

The staff of the Office of the Board of Revenue will be drawn from the Offices of the Revenue Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and the Commissioner for Local Self-Government. Hence, the expenditure on account of the Board of Revenue Establishment will thereby be reduced by about Rs. 200 a month. The total annual cost will, therefore, be about Rs. 13,200 which is expected to be covered by the additional revenue resulting from the increase in the rates of court fee on appeals, applications and vakalats and realisations from copying fees.

A non-recurring expenditure of about Rs. 2,000 will also have to be incurred for furniture, etc.”

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನಲ್ ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಜಡ್ಜರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—That is my idea. I cannot definitely say whether it is possible. That is the present idea of Government.

I want to place before the House the information relating to the institution and disposal of cases before Government. In the year 1952-53, there were

about 354 cases. The receipt in that year was 464 revenue appeals. The total was 818 appeals. In the year 1953-54, 428 appeals were entertained. In the year 1954-55, 487 appeals were entertained. So far, I have disposed of 1,189 revenue appeals, leaving a balance of 554. The pending cases relate to 1953-54 and 1954-55 and three cases of the pending cases relate to 1952-53. There were 161 Muzrai appeals preferred. I have been able to dispose of 119, leaving a balance of about 42.

Now, I come to the Sales-tax revision petitions. In the year 1952-53, 227 petitions were entertained ; in 1953-54, 119 petitions were entertained ; and in 1954-55 up to the end of February, 1955, 159 petitions were entertained. Out of these, 89 petitions are pending now.

Sir, the Select Committee has gone into the details. It is thought that the amendments now made are very useful and the Bill after it becomes law will serve the public. With these observations, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Before I put the consideration motion, I will read the recommendation of His Highness the Rajpramukh, which I received just now.

“In pursuance of clause (3) of article 207 of the Constitution of India, I, Jaya Chamaraja Wadiyar, Rajpramukh of Mysore, do hereby recommend that the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1955, as amended by the Joint Select Committee, be considered by the Mysore Legislative Assembly.”

The question is :

“That the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 2. The question is :

“That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 3. I think there is one amendment tabled by Sri Narayanaswamy to Clause 3 of the Bill.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Sir, I beg to move my amendment which reads thus :

“For Clause 3, the following clause shall be substituted, namely—

“3. *Constitution of the Board.*—

(1) There shall be constituted for the State of Mysore a Board called the Board of Revenue consisting of the following five members :—

(a) the Revenue Commissioner ;

(b) the Excise Commissioner ;

(c) the Commissioner for Local Self-Government ;

(d) a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court or as a District Judge ; and

(e) any other officer to be appointed by Government.

(2) The State Government shall by notification appoint one of the members of the Board to be the Chairman.

(3) A member appointed under clause (d) of sub-section (1) shall hold office for such period as may be determined by the State Government.

(4) Members who are officers of the State Government shall be entitled to the salaries and allowances applicable to them in the service to which they belong and such other allowances as the State Government may determine. The salary, allowances and other conditions of service of a member who is not at the time of appointment an officer of the State Government shall be such as may be determined by the State Government.”

Sir, in this amendment, I have only made the appointment of the District Judge obligatory on the part of the Government. In the Bill as emerged from the Select Committee, we find

that the District Judge can be appointed if the Government minds. The purpose of my amendment is that the appointment of the District Judge should be made obligatory in the constitution of this Board. As it is, Government think that it is necessary to appoint a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court. That will not be the correct approach to a matter of this type. This being a quasi-judicial body, I think the assistance of a judicial officer or a person qualified to be a judicial officer is very necessary, and as such, matters that come up before the Board should have the valuable assistance of a judge.

In my amendment, I have brought in that a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court or as a District Judge should be one of the members. I think Government will accept my amendment because it will be giving the Board a juridical character and will be commendable to all the members of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“For Clause 3, the following clause shall be substituted, namely.—

“3. *Constitution of the Board.*—

(1) There shall be constituted for the State of Mysore a Board called the Board of Revenue consisting of the following five members :—

(a) the Revenue Commissioner ;

(b) the Excise Commissioner ;

(c) the Commissioner for Local Self-Government ;

(d) a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of a High Court or as a District Judge ; and

(e) any other officer to be appointed by Government.

(2) The State Government shall by notification appoint one of the members of the Board to be the Chairman.

(3) A member appointed under clause (d) of sub-section (1) shall hold office for such period as may be determined by the State Government.

(4) Members who are officers of the State Government shall be entitled to the salaries and allowances applicable to them in the service to which they belong and such other allowances as the State Government may determine. The salary, allowances and other conditions of service of a member who is not at the time of appointment an officer of the State Government shall be such as may be determined by the State Government."

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I have carefully gone through the amendment proposed by my friend Sri Narayanaswamy. His intention is that it should be obligatory on the part of the Government to appoint a judicial officer. To achieve that purpose, it is not necessary to alter the provision as proposed by my friend.

I have proposed an amendment which will serve the purpose. Sir, I beg to move :

"That in Clause 3 Sub-clause (1) omit item (i) and after item (c) insert the following item, *viz.*,
'(d) a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court whom the State Government shall by notification appoint'."

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I rise to a point of order. Can a Mover of a motion bring an amendment to his own motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The object will be achieved by this simple change. The provision relating to the appointment of a District Judge is contained in item (i) of sub-clause (1). This item (i) of sub-clause (1) can be omitted and the same provision can be inserted after (c). So, it will be obligatory on the part of the Government to appoint a District Judge or a person who is

eligible to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T. Narasipur).—Why did you not think about it then?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldurg).—Please read the clause after it is amended.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—After it is amended it will read like this :

"3. Constitution of the Board.—

(1) There shall be constituted for the State of Mysore a Board called the Mysore Board of Revenue. The Board shall consist of—

(a) the Revenue Commissioner ;

(b) the Excise Commissioner ;

(c) the Commissioner for Local Self-Government and

(d) a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court whom the State Government shall by notification appoint and the State Government may, if it deems fit, by notification appoint, as additional members any officer or officers of the State Government."

This will be discretionary no doubt. Therefore my amendment will amply serve the purpose. Therefore I appeal to the Hon'ble Member that he may withdraw his amendment and accept mine. I also appeal to the Hon'ble Members that this amendment is very useful and it may kindly be agreed to by them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :—

"That in Clause 3 sub-clause (1) omit item (i) and after item (c) insert the following item, *viz.*,
(d) "a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court whom the State Government shall by notification appoint'."

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—With the acceptance of your amendment, the Board will consist of four members obligatorily. I would like to suggest one point. During the discussion when this Bill was taken up for consideration during the last Session, most of the members pointed that since the three

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

officers, the Revenue Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and the Commissioner for Local Self-Government are executive and touring officers, they may not find much time to attend to the immediate requirements under this Act. Further, the State Government have taken power under this clause to appoint one of the Members of the Board to be the Chairman. Instead of taking that power, it is better that it may be included in this Bill itself that the District Judge that is going to be appointed as one of the Members of the Board shall be the Chairman of the Board. Then it will be obligatory on the part of the Government to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member should have moved an amendment to that effect.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Now that the Minister is allowed to move an amendment, I have suggested modifications.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I envisage certain difficulties and some embarrassments too, because officers are very jealous about their seniority and rank and such other matters. The Judicial Officer may be a senior officer or may not be a senior officer. We may appoint a senior officer. But he may not be senior to the I. A. S. Officers that are there. But, if the judicial officer is the senior most, the Government will have no objection to appoint him as Chairman. But if other officers are senior to him, the senior officers will have to be appointed as Chairman. There is no difference whether a man sits as a Chairman or as a Member because provision has been made for sitting in benches; two of them, the Chairman and one Member will ordinarily sit and dispose of petitions. Your apprehension that these officers may not find time to dispose of cases is not well founded because, as it is, the Revenue Commissioner has to dispose of revenue appeals and revision petitions. The Excise Commissioner has to dispose of cases that are filed before him. Similarly, the Local Self-Government Commissioner too will dispose of cases. Two

of them will continue to sit; for instance, the Revenue Commissioner may sit along with the judicial officer for a fortnight and during another fortnight the other officer and the judicial officer may sit together and dispose of the cases. We will make the necessary rules in regard to these matters.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—The question of seniority does not arise because these officers are recruited to the Revenue Department and other Departments and the District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court will be entirely different and the question of seniority does not come in at all though there may be some difference with regard to the salaries or emoluments drawn by the District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Revenue Commissioner gets a higher salary than the District Judge.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Most of the State Officers in Mysore State are getting much more than what the Ministers are getting today and still the Ministers are bossing over them, do they not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—They are not in the permanent service.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Hon'ble Members can leave it to the discretion of the Government to act according to the circumstances prevailing at a particular time. There is no question of doing it in favour of anybody. It is a question of appointing a Chairman. Suppose an experienced lawyer is appointed as Chairman then there is no difficulty; similarly there is no difficulty in a very senior District Judge or a High Court Judge being appointed as Chairman. As I have already submitted, we cannot commit ourselves to appoint a Judge as a Chairman always.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್ (ನಲಮಂಗಲ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕಮಿಷನರ್, ಎಕ್ಸೈಜ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಫಾರ್ ಲೋಕಲ್ ಸರ್ಪೈಸಸ್ ಗೌರವಮಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಅಫೀಸರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಎಷ್ಟೋನಲ Public Service Commission ರಚನೆ ಆದಾಗ ಉಂಟಾದಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ Depressed Class Member ಆ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒತ್ತಡ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬಂದಿವೆಯೆಂಬುದು ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ Depressed Class Commissionerನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಮಹದಾನಂದವುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You have not moved an amendment to that effect.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಈಗ any other officer ಎಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಮಾನವಾದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಮೂರು ಜನ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಉಳಿದವರನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಇಚ್ಛಾನುಸಾರ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ Depressed Class Commissioner ನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದೋ ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮಾನುಸಾರ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ point ಏನು ?

Sri K. PRABHAKAR.—The point is this. ಮೂರು ಜನ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. Revenue Commissioner, Excise Commissioner, L.S.G. Commissioner. ಆ ಪೈಕಿ Commissioner for Depressed Classes ಎಂದು ನಾಲ್ಕನೇ ಯವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ Excise Commissionerನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಆ ಜಾಗಕ್ಕೆ Depressed Class Commissionerರವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The motion before the House is the amendment moved by Sri Narayanaswamy and the amendment moved by the Revenue Minister. If you have got anything to say on the amendments before us, I can understand your speaking.

Sri K. PRABHAKAR.—He has brought in an amendment in the spirit of 'adding any other member.' ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುವಾಗ ನಾನು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He has specifically stated 'District Judge or a High Court Judge'.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ support ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ Judge ಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You can say that there is no need for a District Judge. That is a different thing.

Sri K. PRABHAKAR.—There is much scope to speak here.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna).—If the Minister is agreeable to his suggestion, he can move an

amendment. You have permitted the Minister to move an amendment already.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Since he has not moved an amendment, I cannot force him.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA.—Sri Prabhakar is making a suggestion. If the suggestion is agreeable to the Minister, then he can move an amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಜಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಕೋಮಿನವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಧ ಎಕರೆ ಒಂದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಪೀಲುಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು).—ಉತ್ತರ).—ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು Amendment table ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—As I have already stated, there is no room for fresh suggestions to be made on this occasion. If you have got anything to say on the amendment before us, you can do so.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—According to the amendment of Sri Narayanaswamy, 'any other officer to be appointed by Government' which is contained in the original Bill after it has emerged from the Select Committee, will be amended as 'any officer or officers of Government'.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—There is no amendment to that clause.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—There is an amendment to Clause (3), and you have also stated therein "any officer or officers of the State Government." Sri Prabhakar may be intending to suggest that under this provision "Commissioner for Depressed Classes" may be appointed. He is perfectly in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I would like to know the opinion of the Revenue Minister.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—All right.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಎಷ್ಟೋನಲ ಚಿಕ್ಕಚಿಕ್ಕ ರೈತರು 1 ಎಕರೆ, $\frac{1}{2}$ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.)

ಅಖಿಲ ಬರುವುದು ಹೊಸ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ. Dispute ಬರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಬೆರೆ 1,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆದರೆ, ರೈತರು 1,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ, 2,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ 3,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲೂ ರಾಯರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಬಡವರು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Is he supporting or opposing the amendment?

Sri K. PRABHAKAR.—I am surely supporting this Bill. ಈ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಹತೋಟಿಯೇನೆಂದರೆ, ರೇವಿನ್ಯೂ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಖಿಲ್ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದು. ಕೇವಲ judicial ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಖಿಲ್ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಒಂದು ಭವವಶೇನೇಂದರೆ, ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್‌ರವರು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣ, ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಅತ್ಯವಶ್ಯಕ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಪ್ಪುಳ್ಳಿರುವ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಿಂದ ಅಂಥ ನಮಗೆ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಾಗ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೋ ಇರಬಹುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು soft corner ಇದೆ. ಆದರೂ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆ ದೊರೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ವಿನಂತಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಒಬ್ಬ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಸಾಮಿ, ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಆ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುವವರು, ಆ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ನಿಷ್ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತವ್ಯಪ್ತಿಯಿರದಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ವಾದಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಇದ್ದ ರೇನೇ ಹರಿಜನರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹರಿಜನರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಎಂದು ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಹರಿಜನರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವವರನ್ನು, ಅವರ advocate ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗುವವರನ್ನು, ಹಾಕಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೇ ವಿನಾ, ಯಾರು ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸದುವೇ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ ನಾರಾಯಣರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಬಾಗೇಪಲ್ಲಿ—ಗುಡಿಬಂಡೆ).—ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರ ಪೈಕಿ ಬಹು ವಂದಿ ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗರೇ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹಾಗೂ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರದೇ

major population ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂವಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜನಗಳು ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದಲೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗರೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಭರತಕ್ಕೆ ಅಖಿಲಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ವಿವಿಧ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್‌ರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೋ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಭಾವಿಸಿದಂತೆ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್‌ರವರು ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನವರೇ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗೇನೋ ಆಗಿ ಬಹುದು ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಯಾರನ್ನೇ ಹಾಕಲಿ, ಅವರು ಎಕ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರೇ ಆಗಿರಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ಸಾರಾದರೂ ಆಗಿರಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂಗಡವರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರುಗಳು ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹರಿಜನರು ರಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನು e g. ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿರುವವರು ರಾಯರುಗಳ ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದವರು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದಾಕ್ಷಣ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರಿದ್ದರೇ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನಾನು ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತರಗತಿಯವರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯುಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್‌ರವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಲಹೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಜನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನೂಜೆನ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಅರೊಬ್ಬರು ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನವರಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಕ್ಷಣ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಸಲ್ಲದೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಡಿಪ್ಟಿಸ್ಟ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಅಫೀಸರು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇ ಸದುವೇ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಡುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not allow you to speak.

Sri M. MADIAH.—I am speaking on the point raised by Sri Prabhakar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Revenue Minister has already replied. Have you got any suggestion to make with reference to the reply made by the Minister?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ.—ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನು discourage ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿದಾರೆ. ಅದರ composition ಅನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾನ್ಸ್‌ನವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಬಾರಾದರೂ advocates ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಊಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Please excuse me. You are not making any suggestions. I do not allow you to speak. You are not making any concrete suggestion to fulfil your desires.

Sri M. MADIAH.—When you have allowed the other Hon'ble Members like Sri Puttaswamy to have his say, is it not right on my part to express my opinion, Sir?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—On a point of order, Sir. ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನೂಕಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದೇನೋ ಸರಿ. ಆದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ದೆಯೇ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ? ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Please wait. I thought he would be in a better position to convince the Minister to substantiate his ground. But now he is not making any concrete suggestions; he is speaking something which is not relevant to the main point. I cannot allow Sri Madiah to speak. I want to know from Sri Narayanaswamy whether he is willing to withdraw his amendment?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—I will withdraw it, Sir.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—He has not sought the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Has the Hon'ble Member got the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Yes, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Have you got anything more to say on your amendment?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—No, Sir. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment before the House.

The question is:

‘That in Clause 3 sub-clause (1) omit item (i) and after item (c) insert the following item, viz.,

(a) “a District Judge or a person qualified to be appointed as a Judge of the High Court whom the State Government shall by notification appoint”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That Clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clauses 4 to 14.

The question is:

“That Clauses 4 to 14 stand part of this Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 4 to 14 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Schedule. The question is:

“That Schedule form part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is:

“That Clause 1 form part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is:

“That the Title and the Preamble form part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.)

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1954, as amended, be passed.”

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1954, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

Matter affecting the privilege of the House.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—I wish to bring to the notice of the Chair the rule 173 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly where it is stated as follows:—

“173 (2) A motion on a matter of privilege arising during the sitting of the Assembly is, notwithstanding anything contained in

rules 41 and 43, entitled to immediate precedence over all other business.”

Now I request whether the Chair is in a position to say anything about the matter that was brought to the notice of the Chair by Sri Rama Rao.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes, Sri M. V. Rama Rao has tabled a privilege motion and that will be considered. The Chair will be in a position to let you know tomorrow.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Before the Chair gives any ruling, I would request the Chair to kindly give an opportunity to the members tomorrow to express their views.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That will be considered tomorrow after the question hour.

The House will now rise for the day and meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The House adjourned at Forty-five Minutes past Four of the Clock to meet again at Two of the Clock on Friday, the 4th March 1955.